

Growth Management Oversight Commission

January 26, 2006
6:00 p.m.

Conference Rooms 2 & 3
Civic Center Building

DRAFT MINUTES

GMOC MEMBERS PRESENT:

Tripp	Krogh	Spethman
Palma	Garcia	Waters
Arroyo	Moya	Little

STAFF PRESENT:

Mark Stephens, GMOC Coordinator
Ed Batchelder, Advance PIng Manager
Frank Rivera, Principal Civil Engineer
Dave Kaplan, Transportation Engineer
Rabbia Phillip, Recording Secretary

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Spethman called the meeting to order at 6:10 p.m.; the Secretary called the roll.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Chairman invited comments on the minutes of the meeting of 01/12/06. Commissioner Tripp made the motion to approve the minutes, seconded by Commissioner Krogh. The minutes were approved unanimously.

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

Commissioner Tripp informed the Commission that the City's budget is now available on disk and that he found the information to be a useful reference.

4. REVIEW OF QUESTIONNAIRES

The Chairman informed the Commissioners that Traffic would be the first topic addressed, as two staff members from the Engineering Department were present to answer any questions.

Traffic

Frank Rivera distributed and referred to a set of maps that represented the levels of service on various street segments at different times of the day. The maps represented only the streets with level of service (LOS) C or below. The maps were prepared in response to the GMOC's request to make the information in the traffic tables more "reader friendly" and easier

to understand. The commissioners reviewed and asked for clarification on some issues, including the LOS on northbound Heritage between Telegraph Canyon Road and Olympic Parkway, where LOS D and E have been measured as a result of signal timing to accommodate flows on major east/west arterials. Commissioner Krogh referred to question #14 and noted that the website listed did not yet give sufficient information from some of the traffic sensors.

Sewer

Mark Stephens pointed out that Frank was able to bring answers to some of the questions raised at the previous meeting on the sewer questionnaire. Mr. Rivera referred to question #13 on wastewater and explained that the flow capacity was based on the size of the pipe. He pointed out the dimensions and allowed flow for the pipes along parts of Moss Street, Center Street, Colorado Avenue and Main Street and also gave the actual flows. In response to questions from the commissioners he explained how the repairs, expansions and upgrades are done. He also gave an indication of the priority and timeline for each of the projects to be completed. The Chairman thanked the Engineering staff for their input.

Water – Sweetwater Authority

Mark reminded the group that the package contained two questionnaires on water, but the one from the Sweetwater Authority was not addressed at the last meeting. Commissioner Spethman noted that the questionnaire indicated that supply depended on the weather and rainfall, but his understanding was the main source of supply was the Colorado River. Ed Batchelder stated that the Sweetwater Authority has local sources and is less dependent on buying imported water than some other water providers; they also have a board policy about using their local sources, but if the demand potentially exceeded the local supply in dry years, they could purchase additional water through the County Water Authority. Also, there is an infrastructure component to the Urban Core Specific Plan (UCSP) and the Sweetwater Authority is in discussions with the City. Commissioner Tripp asked staff if they could keep the GMOC updated on the relations and strategies of infrastructure and development as the UCSP continues. Ed suggested that as the UCSP progresses the Community Development staff could be invited to speak to this Commission on the details and differences of infrastructure planning on the western side of the City compared to the east. The Chairman referred to question #8 on the recycled water from the Duke Power Plant and how that would be used. Commissioner Tripp referred to an article in the Union Tribune concerning this plant and that there was an ISO stipulation that it was a “must run” facility. Staff was requested to provide the Commission with information on the status of the existing power plant and what would happen to the approximately five million gallons per day of water used to

cool generating units if the plant were rebuilt with an alternative cooling system.

Schools - Chula Vista Elementary School District

The commissioners briefly discussed the questionnaire and the answers. Chairman Spethman referred to question #9 and requested clarification on joint use of playfields. He questioned if this body had ever recommended that a city park was an acceptable alternative to school playfields. Mark Stephens said that he didn't think that school playfields were intended to substitute for city facilities, but rather were intended to be complementary. Ed Batchelder said that staff would seek further details from the Director of the Recreation Department, Buck Martin. Commissioner Krogh asked if any sites were identified in reference to question #15 regarding additional school locations in western Chula Vista. Ed answered that no specific sites have been determined, but the General Plan includes policies dealing with siting and funding of school facilities in western Chula Vista.

Parks and Recreation

Chairman Spethman asked for the definition of "offsite recreational use" and requested staff to provide clarification at the next meeting. He also questioned the status of parks for western Chula Vista as the Parks Master Plan is complete, but the updated master plan to address western Chula Vista is not done. Clarification was requested on what is considered in counting park acreage with respect to meeting the GMOC threshold. On question #13, Commissioner Spethman asked about the hours of operation. Questions were also posed about the use of the Boys and Girls Club building at Chula Vista High School.

Commissioner Palma requested information on Otay Park, when it would be constructed with all planned facilities and completed. The Chairman stated that this and other questions could be asked of Buck Martin when he is invited to address this group.

Commissioner Tripp suggested that the GMOC should ask for a breakdown of the parks for active and passive use and state which are parts of the MSCP habitat and use this to acknowledge the diversity of resources and opportunities available. Ed Batchelder mentioned that parks identified through the Chula Vista Bayfront Master Plan should also be considered.

Libraries

Commissioner Krogh asked what would the projection be at build-out, and what is the potential library capacity to support possible density increases at build-out. Staff explained that the General Plan Update assumes a Planning Area population of about 327,000 in 2030, including about 300,000 within existing Chula Vista city boundaries in 2030. Mr. Spethman

made reference to question #2 on page 2 regarding the new Rancho del Rey Branch Library, and asked for an update on that, as well as for the status of the Eastlake High School Library, which is now the only facility serving the entire East side.

Fire

Commissioner Tripp requested information on Chula Vista response times in relation to national standards. The Commission commended the Fire Department for meeting the response time threshold this year. Commissioner Spethman referred to questions #5 and #8 and stated that this Commission still needs to get the requested information. The group concluded that a representative from the Fire Department should be asked to supply clarification. Commissioner Krogh suggested that the questionnaire be amended to ask for a breakdown by station and by shift.

Fiscal

The Chairman asked for input. Commissioner Krogh referred to #2 and asked why the Park Acquisition and Development (PAD) Fee wasn't included in the table of development impact fees. Mark Stephens stated that this was because the PAD fee is governed by different state legislation than those fees shown in the table, and is technically not the same type of development impact fee. After asking the commissioners to raise any issues from the questionnaire and hearing none, the Chairman invited comments on fiscal not directly from the present document.

Commissioner Krogh stated that he still had concerns about whether the City is following State law regarding the use of development impact fees relating to the Interim SR-125 Development Impact Fee. He explained of his concern that the Finance Department's responses to the questionnaire of the previous year did not answer completely the whole issue, and there are other parts of his concerns that he doesn't feel were responded to. The Chairman stated that he would have to firmly stand on record that this issue was not an agenda item at this time, it had been addressed in the past and would not be re-agendized. He reiterated his suggestion as noted in previous GMOC minutes that Commissioner Krogh pursue this to his satisfaction, but as a private citizen and not as a GMOC commissioner. The Chairman stated on record that if Commissioner Krogh felt there were actions in which the City was remiss in its duties regarding the funds in question and if he had evidence to that effect, he should take that through the proper channels to the relevant authorities, as a private individual. Commissioner Tripp suggested a possible avenue. Commissioner Krogh stated that he was reluctant to pursue that line of action and he felt that the role of the GMOC should be to serve as the venue for this type of questioning. He went on record stating that he will not continue this issue but may have to vote negatively when the time comes to vote on the report. The Chairman reiterated that Commissioner Tripp's suggestion

was not a GMOC recommendation, and he asked whether Commissioner Krogh would continue to serve on this body “in protest” and vote negatively on the year-end report. Commissioner Krogh stated that he would not disrupt the working of the GMOC and will respect the authority of the chairman, even if he was not in full agreement with his opinion or ruling. He also stated that at the time of voting on the report he may be able to vote positively as he could possibly have gotten further clarifying information in the interim.

Ed Batchelder pointed out that this commission comes to a decision by majority and although there would be varying opinions on issues around the table, at the time of voting the record could show the vote count.

Commissioner Garcia stated that this group has historically worked towards consensus on issues, and as this matter has apparently gone forward to the satisfaction of the City Attorneys, he suggested that Mr. Krogh pursue it as private citizen to his satisfaction.

5. OTHER ITEMS

There were none at this time.

6. NEXT MEETING

Scheduled for February 9th in the Conference Room of the Ken Lee Building, 430 F Street.

7. ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman moved for adjournment (seconded by Commissioner Palma) and the Commission voted to adjourn the meeting at 8:00 p.m.

Rabbia Phillip
Secretary

Mark Stephens
Growth Management Coordinator